



In attendance:	Board Members: Amanda Burnside (AB) – left at 3.55pm Doug Gale (DG) John Mortimer (JM) – Chairman Alex Reed (AR) David Renard (DR) Adam Schallamach (AS) Mark Smith (MS) Peter Wragg (PW) – Deputy Chairman	Board Advisers and Observers: Paddy Bradley (PB) Cllr Pauline Church (PCh) - representing Baroness Scott of Bybrook OBE (JS) Alistair Cunningham (AC) – arrived at 1.25pm and left at 3pm Ian Durston (ID) Karen Leigh, BEIS Tim Martienssen (TM) Philippa Venables (PV)
Apologies:	Baroness Scott of Bybrook OBE (JS) Col Andrew Dawes (AD) Susie Kemp Cllr Oliver Donachie	
Guest(s):	Tim Dobrashian (TD), Wiltshire Council, Interim Director Economic Recovery Sam Howell, Swindon Borough Council, NEV Project Lead Debby Skellern (DS), SWLEP Rick Kavanagh – representing Col Andrew Dawes (left at 3pm) Leanne Kendrick - Wiltshire Council Paul Redford, Wiltshire Council, Growth & Investment Programme Manager Alan Richell, Wiltshire Council, Interim Growth & Investment Programme Director Leanne Sykes (LS), Wiltshire Council	
Chairman:	John Mortimer	
Minutes:	Deborah House (DKH)	
Location:	Committee Rooms, Wiltshire Council Offices, Monkton Park, Chippenham, SN15 1ER	

Item	Narrative	Deadline
1.0	Welcome / Apologies / Conflicts of Interest	
	<p>The meeting opened at 1.10pm. JM welcomed attendees to the meeting. In particular, welcomes were extended to Rick Kavanagh, who was representing Col Dawes, Karen Leigh, the area representative from BEIS, various officers from both Swindon Borough Council and Wiltshire Council who would be presenting items later in the agenda, and members of the public. Apologies were noted.</p> <p>JM reminded attendees of the Conflict of Interests policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> and re-iterated his Conflict regarding Junction 17, and his previous Conflict with a recipient of a GPIF loan was no longer valid, as the loan had now been issued; 	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PW stated his Conflict regarding the LGF project for the Royal Artillery Museum (RAM); • AR stated his Conflict regarding the IoT, as Catalent was a named partner; • AB stated her Conflict regarding LGF3 and the ongoing projects for Wiltshire College at the Salisbury and Lackham campuses; and • Cllr Church stated her Conflict regarding potential allocation of £1.1m of funds for Salisbury, Item 4.3, as she operated a shop in the City. 	
2.0	Review of Minutes and Matters Arising	
2.1	The minutes of the Board Meeting held on 28 November 2018 were reviewed and approved with a minor amendment under Item 4.3.	
2.2	<p>Matters Arising not on the agenda:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • letters to Homes England re Yarnbrook / West Ashton – letters sent by the Chairman and KL and awaiting further response. The meeting was advised that there had been a change of personnel in the role and KL was to hold a meeting with the new incumbent w/c 28 January 2019; • Southern Connector Road Homes Infrastructure Fund (HIF) – process agreed between SBC and Homes England – Homes England advised submission in March. This would be discussed later in the agenda under Part 2 of the meeting. • The Maltings Outline Business Case (OBC), delayed to a later meeting. This was deferred as work was still in progress. • Briefing on Area Plans – deferred to a later meeting. Part 2 today covers some of the points of interest. Confidential briefing would be given to Board Members on current interest. <p>The Board: NOTED that Zurich had now been confirmed as the Anchor tenant for the Kimmerfields development.</p>	
3.0	<p>Submitted Questions</p> <p>A question had been received from Charmian Spickernell of CPRE, but not in time to give a written response. Mrs Spickernell stated that the Rail Strategy was strongly welcomed and was an important aspect of planning, but she raised a question regarding consultations. The first phase had consulted rail people, but this had been focused on only one specific issue. Mrs Spickernell wanted to know what the next steps were for consultation, as the environment and social issues affected everyone.</p> <p>ID responded to the question and explained that two stages, written and a workshop, had been carried out which included businesses and business</p>	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>representative organisations. A consultation session was held in January at STEAM, which included extensive representation from town councils, unitary authorities, rail user groups and transport provider companies. The strategy document for rail would come to the Board in March and there would be further consultation with representation from planners, town and unitary councils with responsibility for rail and road. The Rail Strategy would also be an important part of the Local Industrial Strategy.</p> <p>The strategy would be available to the general public via the SWLEP website as would all the strategies. Once all the information had been gathered, an independent panel of experts would test the evidence base and a rigorous case would be produced jointly with government. There would be opportunities along the way for input from interested parties. The public was advised to register on the Swindon & Wiltshire Growth Hub to obtain communications and maintain links. As this was Government-funded, consultation was an important aspect of the work to show openness and transparency.</p> <p>The Chairman thanked Mrs Spickernell for her continued interest in SWLEP activities.</p>	
4.0	Local Growth Deal	
4.1	<p>Commissioning Group Project Highlight Reports</p> <p>ID spoke to the paper and advised that the link to the individual highlight reports was on the SWLEP website, but he would be speaking in particular about the focus projects.</p> <p>Chippenham Station Hub</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phase 5, the station forecourt - consultation had been held in Chippenham last week for input from the public; • 1b, northern access lift – initial work has begun on this part of the project; • Phase 2, multi-storey carpark and Sadlers Mead - planning application had been submitted and would come before the strategic planning committee on 20 February. As seen from previous Board meetings, this part of the project was contentious with some local residents. An update would be available at the next Board Meeting; and • Phases 3 and 4, car parks to the north and south of the railway - Network Rail was investigating what was feasible within the timescales. An update would be available at the next Board Meeting. <p>Yarnbrook</p> <p>A Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) application had been submitted, with the announcement of the appointed contractor due shortly once final negotiations with Wiltshire Council and Persimmon Homes had been completed.</p> <p>The Maltings and Central Car Park, Salisbury</p>	<p>Mar '19</p> <p>Mar '19</p>



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>Council on its day-to-day operation;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A350 dualling now completed; and • LGF Sustainable Transport now completed with additional cycle routes around Swindon. <p>ID also noted progress on a non-focus LGF project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Wiltshire College Salisbury campus project where the cladding was going up ahead of schedule. <p>The Board: AGREED that the highlight reports are an accurate representation of current status of all LGF projects.</p>	
4.2	<p>Finance Report – Programme budgets</p> <p>ID spoke to the paper. The situation for the pure LGF projects had worsened slightly by £0.5m because of the ultrafast broadband project. It has been identified that the Superfast deployment in Wiltshire through 2017, by both Wiltshire Online and commercial providers, has exceeded original expectations. A State Aid due diligence exercise is therefore now required to ensure that the Ultra Fast deployment does not affect premises which already have a service. While this exercise is carried out, there is a pause in implementation, causing the delayed spend profile.</p> <p>Therefore, the spend would show in the next financial year 2019/20. All projects were forecasting spend by March 2021.</p> <p>For DFT projects, the spending was broadly in line with forecasts. Great Stall Bridge funding had been moved into the Gablecross and SCR projects as agreed at the last board meeting.</p> <p>The Chairman commented that the Programme Manager was working constantly with scheme promoters to ensure the monies were spent and this was stressed strongly in both the Commissioning Group and at the Board. All promoters were very clear that SWLEP could cancel the funding for projects with Board approval if the projects were such that they were reaching the point that SWLEP believed they could not be delivered by the timescale.</p> <p>The Board: APPROVED the paper as an accurate summary of the current LGF financial position.</p>	
4.3	<p>Proposals for project funding in the South Wiltshire Recovery Plan</p> <p>PB introduced the item and explained the background to the availability of £3.7m from the LGF fund. SBC officers working with Highways England had developed an alternative method of funding an enhanced improvement project for J15 on the M4, so releasing the £3.7m to re-allocated by the SWLEP Board. £1m had been allocated to ultrafast broadband and £1.35m each to Royal</p>	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>Artillery Museum (RAM), which was going ahead, and Swindon Museum & Art Gallery (SMAG), which was not. £200k had been allocated for SBC to come up with some alternative concepts for SMAG and the Council had stated that it supported the allocation of the remaining £1.1m to the South Wiltshire Recovery. As a result, Wiltshire Council was submitting two projects for consideration.</p> <p>TD spoke to the paper and explained that the footfall in Salisbury was down and that the cumulative impact on businesses was still stark. The SWLEP and Wiltshire Council were organising a major event for the business community on 20 February at The Guild Hall to communicate the extent of intervention to help grow the economy and to gain views about proposed future plans.</p> <p>Porton Science Park The first stage of Porton Science Park was almost fully let and we were now looking to future expansion plans involving a much larger development. Some preliminary activity was needed to give momentum to this development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • assess the need for further provision of utilities (electricity, water, gas) and the timeframes involved; • analyse the market to understand what types of businesses from which sectors would be attracted to an enhanced science park; and • develop proposals for financial models to enable the concept of the new development to be brought to the market. <p>£200k was requested to pay for initial development work. The SWLEP would be an integral part of the project team to take forward this work.</p> <p>The Chairman requested a paper back to the board on the creation of team for Porton and business terms and development. Further development of the Porton site is fairly obvious thing for us to want to do and this activity would have to be done at some time in the future anyway. What is the best vehicle for engaging the private sector? AC advised the meeting that examples from past experience were available and maybe to have a positioning paper in time for Lord Henley's visit on 7-8 February 2019.</p> <p>The SWLEP Board: SUPPORTED a project for further development at Porton and requested a revised proposition for funding the development work at the March Board meeting.</p> <p>Illuminating Salisbury Adding a tourism attraction would add value to the night-time economy and increase overnight stays, with audiences on a regular basis, who would spend money in the City. This would feature in a potential bid to the Government's High Street Fund, alongside a Gateways project in Fisherton Street, which was to be submitted by 22 March. Illuminating Salisbury was an oven-ready project, which was part of an integrated strategy for Salisbury. Wiltshire Council was</p>	<p>Mar '19</p>



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>requesting a relatively small amount of money from the SWLEP Board, as it saw most of the funding coming from the High Street Fund. £150k would pay for the feasibility work and content ideas. It needs to be put against a project leading to capital spend, which this would be. The overall project cost was estimated at £1.5-£2m and could be ready in time for the Cathedral 800 years celebrations next year if we moved swiftly.</p> <p>The Board was informed of a number of examples of cities using creative illuminations to attract visitors and the significant benefit it brought to the local economy.</p> <p>The Board sought clarity on the cost of the two phases and was told that £100k would be for infrastructure, for example lasers etc and £50k for proof of concept. The infrastructure would remain constant, with the content changing at regular intervals.</p> <p>There was discussion about the risks involved in the project if the High Street funding was not forthcoming and the sort of private sector support available. AC commented that the Salisbury Business Improvement District (BID) had been very supportive.</p> <p>Cllr Church's opinion was sought because of her knowledge of the area, but owing to her already declared Conflict of Interest, AC responded on her behalf. The cultural body, Wiltshire Creative, would oversee the long-term cultural delivery of this project and there was strong grass roots support.</p> <p>Wiltshire Council would look to underwrite it and find the revenue, but the capital the Council would hope to get from the High Street fund.</p> <p>The Chairman requested that Board Members had sight of the overall South Wiltshire Recovery Plan at the next Board Meeting, in order for Board members to have a whole system view of the Recovery rather than making decisions on individual projects.</p> <p>The Board: AGREED to fund £100k for the second phase of the research into proving the concept on the condition that Wiltshire Council would repay the £100k from their revenue.</p> <p>The Board: AUTHORISED the Director to re-allocate £1.1m from the Local Growth Deal to support projects proposed by the South Wiltshire Operations Board which meet the economic outcomes sought by the Swindon and Wiltshire Local Enterprise Partnership; REQUIRED a report from the Director to the Board meeting on 20 March 2019 on the definitive list of projects seeking Board support and the timescale for the use of the funding for those with developed proposals.</p>	<p>Mar '19</p> <p>Mar '19</p>



Item	Narrative	Deadline
5.0	Strategic Developments	
5.1	<p>SWLEP Incorporation progress report</p> <p>PB spoke to the paper giving an update on progress, advising the meeting that the SWLEP had become a not-for-profit company limited by guarantee on 14 January 2019 and that it was progressing with plans for SWLEP Limited to take over current operations by the end of March 2019.</p> <p>Action: AC and SK and respective legal teams to meet with PB to ensure clarity about governance arrangements in the transition from the “old” SWLEP to the “new” SWLEP Ltd.</p> <p>The Chairman stressed that the submission of our amended assurance framework was crucial by the end of March and that this would be brought to the March Board Meeting for approval.</p> <p>PB advised that all existing business Board Members had indicated that they were content to continue on the Board of SWLEP Limited. Both Local Authorities were finalising who would take their allocated places on the new Board.</p> <p>The Board: NOTED the progress made in the incorporation process</p>	Mar '19
5.2	<p>Spending plan for additional funding</p> <p>PB spoke to the paper. £280.300 had been allocated to help towards the costs of the development of the Local Industrial Strategy and incorporation and was made up as follow:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • £200k confirmed funding from BEIS against a provisional spending plan; • £75k from DfE, in return for the submission by Friday 25 January of a Memorandum of Understanding which meets the governance and membership requirements of Skills Advisory Panels and the development of a fine-grained analysis of skills and employment data; and • £5,300 from ESRC to support Local Industrial Strategy (LIS) research and the evidence base. <p>The idea was to use more money from the BEIS pot by using researchers to test three big ideas. That internal resource could be flexed and adapted as the ideas emerge.</p> <p>DR commented that he would like to extend the work regarding hydrogen to include the opportunities presented by a A420 link from the M4 corridor into the Cambridge-Milton Keynes-Oxford arc. PB agreed to add this reference. AB stated that there was a need to review the remit of the Local Authorities'</p>	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<p>separate employment and skills boards in the light of single LEP-wide group the DfE was looking for to fulfil the role of the Skills Advisory Panel (SAP). The SWLEP's Skills and Talent Subgroup could fulfil the role of the SAP with some minor changes to its terms of reference. This matter had also been raised at the Commissioning Group, including the need to maintain knowledge and expertise from Local Authority Skills and Employments Boards, which could involve invited some members to join the revised Skills and talent Subgroup.</p> <p>Action: PB and AB to draft a proposal to take to the Skills & Talent Subgroup for discussion.</p> <p>The Board: APPROVED the spending plan for the additional funding.</p>	<p>05/03/19</p>
<p>5.3</p>	<p>Economic Planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Energy Strategy key performance indicators <p>PB spoke to the paper and explained the measures to be used.</p> <p>The Board: APPROVED the use of the key performance indicators for the Energy Strategy as indicated in section 3.7; and REQUESTED an annual report in the May of each year, commencing in May 2020 on the extent of achievement of the key performance indicators.</p>	
<p>5.4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rail Strategy Position Statement <p>As Chairman of the working group, PW introduced the paper. ID was leading on the work and stated that an extremely successful well-attended workshop had been held on 16 January led by Systra and SLC Rail. This strategy would feed into the LIS. It would show where the economic opportunities were from new services being provided by the Government and where, with new provision, the SWLEP could support economic growth. The intended outcomes of the Rail Strategy include a list of investment priorities in descending order according to potential contribution to the economy. The main emerging line options were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bristol – Swindon - Oxford – Cambridge • Southampton – Swindon – Oxford – Birmingham • Swindon – Gloucester – Birmingham – Manchester <p>with the following emerging station options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Swindon East • Swindon West / Moredon Bridge • Devizes Parkway 	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Porton Parkway • Corsham • Ashton Park • With Further investigation needed regarding a parkway station at Wilton. <p>DR commented that he would like Swindon strengthened, for example, the line through to Didcot, where work was needed for four-tracking.</p> <p>Questions were raised about how this strategy overlapped with that of GWR and Network Rail, as their project plans were complicated and long-term and discussions would have to be held now to ensure our priorities were built into their Phase plans. This needed to focus on integration of transport planning, including access to and from main hub stations through a range of public transport methods and the provision of adequate parking at these new stations</p> <p>JM commented that no change would happen in the area, unless we promoted it ourselves, as there would be no government money for such schemes. The quickest way was to get private sector to deliver it and SWLEP had just seen a presentation on third party delivery for station schemes.</p> <p>The Strategy would be brought to the SWLEP Board Meeting in March for approval.</p> <p>The Board: APPROVED the draft position statement, with suggested amendments, as an acceptable direction of travel for the SWLEP Rail Strategy.</p>	Mar '19
6.0	SWLEP Core Activity	
6.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chairman's update <p>The list of meetings the Chairman had attended since the last meeting was in the published Board pack. No additional questions were raised.</p>	
6.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Director's Report <p>The activities were listed in the published Board pack. No additional questions were raised.</p> <p>The Board: NOTED the contents of the Chairman's and Director's reports.</p>	
7.0	AOB	
	None.	
	Date of next meeting / Closing remarks	
	The next meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, 20 March 2019 at 9.30am in the Kennet Room, County Hall, Bythesea Road, Trowbridge, BA14 8JN.	
	Close of Public Meeting at 3.15pm.	



Item	Narrative	Deadline
PART TWO		
8.1	<p>Chippenham developments</p> <p>Relevant Conflicts of Interest were noted.</p> <p>Alan Richell and Paul Redford presented to the meeting on a proposed scheme in Chippenham. This Housing Infrastructure Fund bid will be submitted by 1 March 2019. Letters of support had been received from most landowners and a Business Case was being developed for the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government.</p> <p>The Board: SUPPORTED this scheme in principle subject to being provided with a confidential document mapped against the SWLEP strategy and draft of covering letter which would allow Members to consider any of the implications and make decisions ex-committee.</p> <p>Action: AR to provide Board Members with the necessary documentation.</p>	31/01/19
8.2	<p>New Eastern Villages (NEV)</p> <p>PV introduced the presentation and Sam Howells spoke to the meeting explaining the importance of the Southern Connector Road to the overall NEV scheme and the submission of a HIF bid in March.</p> <p>The Board: NOTED the contents of the presentation.</p> <p>The Chairman thanked the presenters for their contributions.</p>	
Close of Part Two of Meeting at 4.15pm		



From CPRE Wiltshire, Charmian Spickernell, CPRE Wiltshire Vice-Chairman

QUESTION

The rail strategy is welcomed but it is not clear that the first round of consultation was widely advertised.

Is there a clear pathway for the next steps and will there be wider consultation, to include environmental and social issues, with the roll forward of the Local Plans before decisions are made?

RESPONSE

The response to the question was given verbally at the Board Meeting and is contained in the Board minutes under Item 3.0.

